



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/292,190	04/15/1999	LUCIANO CHAVEZ JR.	AT9-98-737	3199

7590

02/11/2002

DUKE W YEE  
CARSTENS YEE & CAHOON LLP  
PO BOX 802334  
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2002

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/292,190**

Applicant(s)

**Chavez**

Examiner

**Khanh Dinh**

Art Unit

**2155**



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 8, 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

### Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2155

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to the Response to Office Action filed on 1/8/2002 (paper # 4). Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Wolff et al., US pat. No.6,044,367.

As to claim 1, Wolff discloses a method for executing a function on a server in a distributed data processing system, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

receiving a request for a function (I/O functions), wherein the request comprises an input specifying a server name, wherein the server responds to requests directed to a set of server names (plurality of servers 104A-106A of fig.1A), and executing the function in a server name context on the server as directed by the input specifying the server name (see abstract, Figs. 1A, 2A, 3A, col.4 line 14 to col.5 line 67, col.6 line 31 to col.7 line 58).

Art Unit: 2155

As to claim 2, Wolff discloses a set of resources (i.e., memory resources) associated with a server name (see fig.1C, col.7 line 17 to col.8 line 65 and col.10 lines 15-52).

As to claim 3, Wolff discloses identifying a membership of a resource within the set of resources for the server name context (see col.6 lines 1-64 and col.7 line 17 to col.8 line 65).

As to claim 4, Wolff discloses generating a server name tag for the server name, wherein the membership of the resource in the set of resources is identifiable by the server name tag associatively stored with the resource (see col.6 lines 1-64 and col.7 line 17 to col.8 line 65).

As to claim 5, Wolff discloses the server name tag is generated based on a value of the server name and a value derived from a data structure that stores the server name (see fig.1B, col.5 line 56 to col.8 line 24 and col.15 line 61 to col.16 line 45).

As to claim 6, Wolff discloses the value derived from the data structure is a position value of the server name within a server name table that stores the set of server names (see fig.5A-B, col.19 line 32 to col.21 line 33 and col.23 lines 12-54).

As to claim 7, Wolff discloses the request for the function is received from a network (see fig1A).

Art Unit: 2155

As to claim 8, Wolff discloses locating the server name in an entry of a server name table; obtaining a location index for the entry; and generating a server name mask based on the location index (see tables 6, 7, col.17 line 43 to col.18 line 36 and col.33 line 9 to col.35 line 33).

As to claim 9, Wolff discloses generating a server name mask based on the server retrieving a server name mask for a resource from a resource data structure and comparing the generated server name mask with the retrieved server name mask to identify whether the resource is applicable to the server name (see fig.5B, col.20 line 33 to col.22 line 44).

As to claim 10, Wolff discloses repeatedly identifying a plurality of resources that are applicable to the server name by searching plurality of resource data structures for matching server name masks (see fig.5B, col.20 line 33 to col.22 line 44).

As to claim 11, Wolff discloses server name masks is a bitwise AND operation (i.e., Boolean function, see fig.10B, col.30 line 62 to col.31 line 65).

Claims 12-20 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1-6, 8, 9, 10 respectively.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1 and 2 respectively.

Art Unit: 2155

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/8/2002 have been fully considered but they are found not persuasive.

\* Applicant asserts that the Wolff reference does not disclose the server responding to requests directed to a set of server names and executing the function in a server name context on the server as directed by the input specifying the server name.

*Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wolff clearly discloses the server responding to requests directed to a set of server names and executing the function in a server name context on the server as directed by the input specifying the server name (i.e., using some administrative servers such as 104B and 106B of fig. 1A to handle requests from normal client 100A, then the server 106B passes the I/O request via a path to the administration server, see fig. 1A, 1B, 2A, col.4 line 14 to col.5 line 67 and col.6 line 31 to col.7 line 58).*

\* *In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the*

Art Unit: 2155

*applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).*

*\* Therefore, the examiner asserts that Wolff teaches or suggests the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 12 and 21 as required under 35 U.S.C 102(e). Claims 2-11, 13-20 and 22 are rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 12 and 21 and by other reasons set forth in the previous Office Action (paper #3, mailed on 8/28/2001)*

### ***Conclusion***

5. Claims 1-22 are *rejected*.
6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2155

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-8528. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers for this group are:


After Final: (703) 746-7239

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official/ Draft: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 -9600.

Khanh Dinh  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2155  
1/28/2002

  
**DAVID WILEY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**